

MEMORANDUM FOR: Colonel Stanley J. Grogan

SUBJECT: Revised Draft, Enno Hobbing Article on CIA

P. 1, first paragraph. The statement, "The CIA man discreetly launches his covert propaganda and disinfects a foreign political climate poisoned by Red insinuations," etc., indicates that CIA is concerned with more than espionage and intelligence coordination. Then it says that the "CIA man gets no public acclaim," which seems to be negated by this article itself.

P. 2, second paragraph. This page says that CIA was responsible for getting copies of Khrushchev's speech. I thought it had been agreed that this would be left out.

P. 2, same second paragraph. Is it necessary to specify location of CIA buildings on the Reflecting Pool?

PP. 2-3, last paragraph P. 2. This not only includes the remark about CIA's justification based on alleged acquisition of Khrushchev's speech, but seems by inference to claim a lot for CIA on the basis of this one occurrence. If, as is possible, it is publicly supposed that CIA sponsored this article, it might be accused of making far-fetched claims.

P. 3, middle paragraph. "(Some first class second-story men work quite legally for CIA.)" I am not sure that all readers would consider this favorable to CIA.

P. 3, middle paragraph. "By one or more of these ways, CIA scored its coup in securing the Khrushchev speech." If taken as a statement of fact, this would look like a revelation of methods.

P. 4, paragraph beginning on previous page. On the morality of intelligence work. My guess is that this would offend as many people as it would convince (Wilsonian ideology and the alleged naivety of Henry L. Stimson).

P. 7. "... The National Intelligence Estimates -- the closely reasoned and finely qualified studies ..." What does "finely qualified" mean?

P. 7. "Guidance for the National Security Council." "Guidance" would not seem quite the word.

P. 7, last paragraph. On the covert side of CIA. Here CIA "creates the circumstances which the overt side evaluates." This is a curious piece of phraseology that might be interpreted several ways.

P. 10, first paragraph. On State control of CIA. I would agree with the marginal comment that this is bad.

P. 10, second paragraph. This is what I referred to in my first comment as the public dissection of DD/P. I should still oppose it.

P. 11, first paragraph. I should also object to this boasting about our skill in the use of intelligence devices.

P. 11, last paragraph. The alleged method of getting agents seems to be repeated in all texts on intelligence. Nothing in particular seems to be gained by attributing it directly to CIA.

P. 14, paragraph on [REDACTED] This seems to me something like the rather far-fetched claims for CIA that could be inferred from the acquisition of Khrushchev's speech. (We got [REDACTED] hence the [REDACTED] government changed hands.)

P. 15, first paragraph. On CIA propaganda. This may be, as indicated in the margin, "good" and "O.K.", but I think it would cause the cynical to smile, to say the least.

P. 16, first paragraph. This may be, as indicated in the margin, on [REDACTED] and well-put, but if it is intended to reassure the public about harm that might be done by "free-wheeling attributed to CIA," I suggest it might have the opposite effect in some cases in that CIA

seems to be described as an agency that is in a position to cause great mischief.

P. 17. I doubt that Mr. Hobbing's concluding sermon on the CIA man's "profound sense of morality" would be well-taken in all pulpits.



STATINTL